



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09/633,876 8/7/00 ASAAD et al

EXAMINER
T. VO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2189	9

DATE MAILED:

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tim Vo (3)  
(2) Peter A. Balzare 46,199 (4)

Date of Interview 10/29/03

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No If yes, brief description:

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent Claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: WATTS

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed structure feature of a "bridge". Examiner replied such structure is not disclosed in the claim's language. Proposed amendment need further search/or consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

## **Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Section 713.04 Substance of Interview must Be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application, whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### **\$1.133 Interviews**

(b) In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for response to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C.132)

§ 1.2. Business to be transacted in writing. All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete a two-sheet carbon interleaf Interview Summary Form for each interview held after January 1, 1978 where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks in neat handwritten form using a ball point pen. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate paper number, placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" list on the file wrapper. The docket and serial register cards need not be updated to reflect interviews. In a personal interview, the duplicate copy of the Form is removed and given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephonic interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the telephonic interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Serial Number of the application
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (personal or telephonic)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the claims discussed
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). (Agreements as to allowability are tentative and do not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.)
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview
- Names of other Patent and Trademark Office personnel present.

The Form also contains a statement reminding the applicant of his responsibility to record the substance of the interview.

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his obligation to record the substance of the interview in each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check a box at the bottom of the Form informing the applicant that he need not supplement the Form by submitting a separate record of the substance of the interview.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview:

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted.
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete or accurate, the examiner will give the applicant one month from the date of the notifying letter or the remainder of any period for response, whichever is longer, to complete the response and thereby avoid abandonment of the application (37 CFR 1.135(c)).

### **Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

Applicant's summary of what took place at the interview should be carefully checked to determine the accuracy of any argument or statement attributed to the examiner during the interview. If there is an inaccuracy and it bears directly on the question of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the record is claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth his or her version of the statement attributed to him. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication "Interview record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

LAW OFFICES OF  
**McGINN & GIBB, PLLC**

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817  
TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100  
FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376  
E-MAIL: MCGINNGIBB@AOL.COM

SEAN M. MCGINN  
PHILLIP E. MILLER†  
FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDER†  
PETER A. BALNAVE, PH.D.  
FREDRIC J. ZIMMERMANT  
JAMES E. HOWARD†  
CHRISTOPHER M. MCGINN\*  
†MEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA  
\*PATENT ENGINEER (NON-ATTORNEY)

ANNAPOLIS, MD OFFICE  
FREDERICK W. GIBB, III  
MOHAMMAD S. RAHMAN††

October 28, 2003

**FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

TO: Examiner Tim T. Vo FAX No. (703) 746-5665  
USPTO  
Art Unit 2189

FROM: Peter A. Balnave FAX No. (703) 761- 2375

RE: Outline for Personal Interview  
for Serial No. 09/633,876  
scheduled for Wednesday, October 29, 2003  
at 10:00 AM.

COMMENTS: Please see attached. Total of 2 pages, including cover page.

This facsimile message and attachments (if any) may contain information that is privileged, confidential, Attorney-Work Product or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. This message and any attachment(s) are intended only for the individual or entity named above (or those properly entitled to access the information). If the reader of this transmission is not the intended or an authorized recipient, any unauthorized distribution, dissemination, or copying of this transmission and the attachment(s) (if any) is prohibited.

If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify McGinn & Gibb, PLLC at any of the numbers indicated above or by e-mail.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Examiner Tim T. Vo  
Re: 09/633,876  
October 28, 2003

PROPOSED INTERVIEW OUTLINE

I. Applicant's understanding of the invention.

**bridge** *n.* 1. A device that connects networks using the same communication protocols so that information can be passed from one to the other. *Compare* gateway. 2. A device that connects two LANs (local area networks), whether or not they use the same protocols, and allows information to flow between them. The bridge operates at the ISO/OSI data-link layer. *See also* data-link layer. *Compare* router. (Microsoft Computer dictionary, 4th Ed.)

II. Applicant's understanding of claims 1 and 10, and possibly 8.

Each of the above claims recites in relevant part "an extended bridge." It is Applicant's position that to one of ordinary skill in the art, a "bridge" comprises more than a physical connector at the ISO/OSI physical layer. A "bridge" may include at least such functions as buffering, amplifying, and in an embodiment of the invention, the conversion of parallel data to serial data and the subsequent conversion of the transmitted serial data back to parallel data.

III. Applicant's understanding of the prior art of Watts.

Applicant understands that the serial bus 13 of the portable computer and the expansion bus of the docking station 10 comprise physical layer connections, which one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider to be a "bridge."

IV. Request by the Applicant to the Examiner for possibly, "improved" claim language.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY